Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To advance the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims and the following remarks are submitted.

As an initial matter, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's determination that claims 1-4 and 9-15 are allowed.

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious based on Mocek (US Document No. 20030182577-A1, hereinafter, "Mocek"). Applicants have amended claim 21 to include certain limitations that are consistent with the "allowable subject matter" identified at page 4 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 as amended is allowable.

Mocek is directed to a system for validating and qualifying application programs to be deployed in vehicles in connection with telematics applications (Abstract and Fig. 6). The disclosed system includes carlets 132, which are implemented as Java applications (¶ [0042], line 1). The carlets 132 appear to communicate with the hardware 120 of a vehicle via a Java Virtual Machine 124 (Fig. 5A). Although the Java Virtual Machine 124 appears to handle communication with the hardware of different types of vehicles, the precise mechanism whereby communication with different vehicle types may be achieved is not disclosed.

In contrast with Mocek, claim 21 as amended is directed to a telematics system that includes, inter alia, "a database for storing vehicle specific data bus configuration information for a plurality of makes and models of vehicles." Mocek does not disclose a database as recited in claim 21 as amended or anything analogous to the database. As stated, the precise mechanism in Mocek for allowing communication with different vehicle types is not disclosed. Claim 21 as amended further recites "an abstract software layer" that is "constructed and arranged for retrieving data bus configuration information for the proprietary data bus of the vehicle from the database in response to a request for vehicle parameter data from [a] telematics application, for extracting vehicle parameter data from the proprietary vehicle data bus using the data bus configuration information, and for providing the extracted data to the telematics application." Mocek does not disclose this aspect of claim 21 as amended or anything analogous thereto.

Therefore, all the limitations of claim 21 as amended are not disclosed by Mocek, nor are they obvious based on Mocek. Therefore, the rejection of claim 21 as amended under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is overcome. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 as amended is allowable.

2

Claims 18-20 and 22-23 depend from claim 21 and are allowable for the same reasons.

The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious based on *Mocek*. Applicants have amended claim 24 to include certain limitations that are consistent with the "allowable subject matter" identified at page 4 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 as amended is allowable.

Claim 24 as amended is directed to a method of deploying a telematics application in a plurality of vehicles having different makes and/or models, wherein an abstract software layer is installed within each of the plurality of vehicles and is operatively connected to a data bus of the respective vehicle. The method includes, *inter alia*,

retrieving, by the abstract software layer and responsive to [a] generic request for vehicle parameter data by the telematics application, vehicle data bus configuration information from a database that stores data bus configuration information for a plurality of different types of data buses, the retrieved vehicle data bus configuration information being associated with the type of data bus used on the vehicle on which the telematics application is run;

extracting vehicle parameter data from the vehicle data bus using the vehicle data bus configuration information retrieved from the database; and

providing the extracted vehicle parameter data to the telematics application to satisfy the generic request.

Mocek does not disclose, *inter alia*, the "retrieving" step, the "extracting" step, or the "providing" step as recited in claim 21 as amended. Indeed, *Mocek* does not disclose any details pertaining to how communication with different makes and/or models of vehicles is achieved. Therefore, claim 21 as amended is not obvious based on *Mocek*.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 24 as amended under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome, and claim 24 as amended is allowable.

Conclusion:

Applicant contends that the application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any question regarding this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney so that any such question can be resolved in order that the present application can proceed toward allowance.

3

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce D. Rubenstein
Reg. No. 39,349
Attorney for Applicants

Atty. Docket : TERAD-11-US
Telephone   : 781-274-0202
Fax   : 781-274-0201

4